

Remarks/Arguments

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant submits that the amendment above clearly places the claims into condition for allowance for the reasons stated below. Because no further consideration or search is required, applicant requests that the amendment be entered pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116.

Status of Claims

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 48 and 49. Claims 1-14, 16-20 and 41-47 have been rejected. Dependent claims 2, 5-11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 44 have been amended to change the dependency to allowed claim 49. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice, and applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of independent claim 1 in a continuation application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14, 16-20, and 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,752,922 to MacAnally, et al. (“MacAnally”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,302 to Yamanaka (“Yamanaka”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,580,054 to Liu et al. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacAnally and Yamanaka and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,181,224 to Snyder (“Snyder”). Although applicants traverse these rejections, in an effort to expedite allowance, independent claim 1 has been canceled and the dependent claims have been amended to change the dependency to allowed claim 49. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Advisory Action

After filing the previous Reply on July 5, 2006, an Advisory Action was mailed stating that the claim amendments were not entered because the claims raise the issue of new matter in that copper is not disclosed in the specification. Applicants respectfully point out that copper was recited in claim 15 as filed in the original application. In the Amendment and Reply dated January 18, 2006, claim 48 was presented including a combination of the subject matter of claim

15 and claim 1. To provide explicit support for this claimed limitation in the specification, applicants have now amended paragraph 0067 of the specification to state “metal films such as copper or molybdenum.” Applicants respectfully submit that the inclusion of copper in claim 48 and the amendment to the specification to describe copper do not present an issue of new matter, because the claims as filed in the original specification are part of the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06. Accordingly, applicants request entry of these amendments and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

The claims have been shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicant believes that this paper is responsive to each and every ground of rejection cited by the Examiner in the Action dated April 5, 2006, and respectfully requests favorable action in this application. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant’s attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2121 (Reference Number JPSA001).

Respectfully submitted,

GROSSMAN, TUCKER, PERREAULT & PFLEGER PLLC

Date: August 4, 2006

By: _____ /kjc/
Kevin J. Carroll, Reg. No. 36,384

55 S. Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101
Telephone: (603) 668-6560
Facsimile: (603) 668-2970